

REDMOND PARK BOARD
Minutes
September 2, 2004
Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

I. Call to order

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:00 p.m.

Board members present: Chair Lori Snodgrass, Seth Kelsey, David Degenstein, Ann Callister, David Ladd, Sue Stewart, and Katherine Zak, Youth Advocate

City staff present: Danny Hopkins, Parks and Recreation Director; Jean Rice, Park Planning Analyst; Mike Paul, Public Work Project Manager – Municipal Campus Park Master Plan; Ken Wong, Old Firehouse Teen Center Director; Morgan Hargraves, Trails Commission Youth Advocate; Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary

Welcome to Morgan Hargraves, new Youth Advocate to the Trails Commission

Welcome to Ken Wong, Old Firehouse Teen Center Director - Ken Wong was introduced to the Board as the Department's newest staff member and Director of the Old Firehouse Teen Center. Ken came to the City from Youth Eastside Services, has voluntarily served on the Board of the Redmond Youth Partnership Committee and is currently serving as staff advisor to the Redmond Youth Partnership Council (RYAC). Ken also volunteers on the Board of the YMCA.

Snodgrass and Wong had previously discussed a liaison between a RYPAC Council member and the Park Board's Youth Advocate; a way for Board members to learn, through the youth advocates, more about the RYPAC Council and ways the public can help out and exchange information and ideas.

II. Approval of Minutes

The Redmond Park Board minutes of July 8, 2004 were approved as presented:

Motion for approval of the July 8, 2004 Redmond Park Board minutes as amended.

Motion by: Kelsey

Second by: Stewart

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

III. Items from the Audience

1 – Morgan Hargraves, Trails Commission Youth Advocate

IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

- Tennis Courts at Grass Lawn Park – Callister – noted that the tennis courts up at Grass Lawn Park were well utilized. She also noted that the “bang wall” was notably too low – Zak had, at a previous meeting, noted that tennis balls were being hit over the top of the existing wall. Hopkins noted that a black net would be installed at the top of the wall; the netting would not be noticeable.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Trust for Public Lands – Adam Ikeburg

Ikeburg reviewed and briefly discussed the highlights of the Feasibility Study and funding mechanisms as outlined in the handout given to the Board in their July packets.

Ikeburg discussed the various options; costs to average citizens of Redmond and election history – to see how things have been historically done and what the fiscal framework looked like.

The goal of the feasibility study is to make sure everyone has a common frame of reference.

Overview – Pages 3 & 4

Understanding of community - Redmond's strong population.

Economy – Page 5

Highlight is; medium income is significantly higher than the aggregate of King County. Housing costs commensurate of income.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Page 6

Total number of parks and open space inventory in community

Government – Page 6

Introduction as to Redmond's elected officials.

Budget - Page 7 & 8

Understanding of fiscal framework; look for places where there may be and the ability to move money from one account to another without going out to voters. Redmond is on a tight budget; running balance budget/deficit budget.

Parks and Recreation Department - Page 9

Total department budget, baseline for what the department is running on.

Redmond Parks M&O Fund - Page 10

Redmond Capital Improvement Program (CIP) - Page 12

CIP funds available for parks. \$4 million fund balance written, actual \$2.

Debt -Page 14

Redmond doesn't have much debt, which gives the City a capacity in the community should there be voter will and political will to go out and issue debt.

Local Finance Options - Page 15

- In Washington there are several mechanisms to use for funding.
- Property taxes - restrictive property tax growth limitations (Page 16) - in order to increase property tax in the community - levy lid lift (above statutory limitations are on property tax)

Estimated Revenue and Cost of Additional Mill Levy - Page 20

Millage increases per average household. Quick growth - break point at \$50 or less - varies per community. Bellevue's attempt at \$100 per year household increase failed; Kirkland successfully passed a levy lid and bond measure with \$60 a year per household increase.

Ikeburg's past experience shows that property taxes funding M&O most often pass successfully. A small property tax paired with a bond measure or other fiscal mechanism to fund the M&O appeared to be the best direction.

Bonds - Page 21

How bonds and debt are calculated within the City.

City of Redmond Bond Financing Costs – Page 22

Basic finance rates and bond funding scenario. \$10 million bond measure at 5% interest would cost average household \$34 per month.

Hopkins noted that since the last meeting the City has initiated a City Hall project.

Ikeburg added that there is about \$130 million worth of Councilmatic bonds without public vote.

Revenue Bonds – Page 23

Tied specifically to funding stream – sales tax, development fees; something that comes in every year that you sell revenue bonds against. Chart on page illustrates how much debt service it would take to get to a certain bond issue; it does not identify funding sources. Not recommended as a long term funding solution.

Sales and Use Tax – Page 25

City is currently capped on sales and use tax. Very strong mechanism for parks and park improvements. Good passage rate.

Real Estate Excise Tax - Page 25

Currently “max”, usually greatly opposed. No real future.

Utility Tax – Page 27

Mechanism that has been used in Washington State to pay for park improvements. Currently Olympia has a 3% utility tax proposition on the ballot. At ½ cent, \$1.5 million can be raised; 1 cent - \$3 million raised in one year. Opportunity to sell revenue bonds against that income stream while preserving some monies for M&O in the future.

Bond Measures – Bonds and bond money cannot be used for M&O, used for capital. Not traditional, but used in several communities and highly recommended to consider given its potential to raise money.

Elections – Page 28

When, How and Rules – notice, posting, timelines, general information.

Election Analysis – Page 29

Fiscal measure related. Measures need to meet the 60% threshold in order to pass a bond measure.

Analysis of King County measures that went forward in 2000.

Appendices – Page 30-31

Summary of current Parks and Recreation funding and sample bond funding.

Options for funding – Bonds accompanied with a M&O Levy or Utility Tax.

The Feasibility Study is complete, indicating that moving to the next step.

Four step method:

- Feasibility Study Research
- Public Opinion Survey Polling – what mechanism, what level and what purposes/component (where does the public want to spend their money to make this a successful endeavor)
- Design measure to help write the ballot language, design implementation ordinance/resolution to meet criteria for polling
- Running and winning the campaign

Hopkins noted that with input from staff, council, Mayor and Parks Board, a common goal on what priority projects should be funded. Alignment from the community will be a good sounding board.

Ikeburg recommended that the department move forward seek out a “pollster” who will do a statistically designed telephone survey of voters. Return with response. Ikeburg also recommended testing an M&O property tax with an accompanying bond and utility tax.

Kelsey inquired about the timeline to accomplish the four steps. Ikeburg suggested three month (compressed) spread out to one to four years. He also noted that the following steps would take place:

- Contract/hire a pollster
- Schedule another meeting with Park Board – complete pre-survey questionnaire
- First draft (2 to 3 weeks or 1 month)
- Staff and elected officials review
- Field
- One week for analysis
- Back to Park Board meeting
- Council Study Session

- Timeline from this point is back out from this point

Motion by Kelsey to proceed with necessary polling. Second by Stewart. All in favor. Motion unanimously carried 7-0.

Ikeburg suggested that October or November would not be a good time to field survey questions. Between Thanksgiving and Christmas or after New Years was suggested as a good time. Ikeburg will return to the Park Board meeting in October for further discussion. Sample surveys will be sent to Board members before the next meeting via paper or e-mail copy.

B. Municipal Campus Master Plan – Kris Snider & Mike Paul

Kris Snider, Hewitt Architects, gave the Board a brief overview of the Plan and discuss phasing and dollars. The Board had received the Phasing Plan before the meeting in their monthly packets.

The phasing plan was discussed and a final plan will be presented to the Board in the next one to two months. All commissions, boards, staff and executive had been presented the plan and this was the culmination of all input.

Phasing - Overview

- Phase I – City Hall and Parking Garage – costs are pre-determined through the measures through funding – somewhat staggered, but complete at the same time. Basic philosophy was to come up with common sense of phasing of sequential improvement that would make the most sense – compliment phasing as it goes. Thinking of it in “chunks” of dollars. Phasing can be combined if the dollars are there.
- Phase II – Heron House (River observatory)
Landscaping is the biggest dollar amount. Lock City Hall to trail system – landscaping will provide a strong connection to river.
- Phase III – Open Space, connection to river.
- Phase IV – Open center with green space
- Phase V.a. – covered connection along the Public Safety Building along the garage to City Hall
- Phase V.b. – adjunct – urban connection across from point to point – can be corded off for sitting area. Large gathering spaces, forming an anchor.
- Phase VI – Open area and landscaping (possible new building site).

- Phase VII – Across street (160th) for possible Demonstration Garden – drought tolerant plants, NW plants
- Phase VIII – Across river, adding more plants and evergreen trees, frame river, soften background
- Phase IX – On King County property line. Last planned area on site. Development depends on what happens to the existing courthouse.

This is a \$10 million Master Plan excluding Phase I. Biggest “chunks” \$2 to \$ ½ million dollars. Water featured areas are most costly.

Degenstein requested a list of site furnishing inventory for Phase I – benches, light fixtures, picnic tables, bike racks, etc. All other phases have site furnishing inventory lists.

Snodgrass noted her concern about the lighting elements throughout the campus. Snider asked the Board to submit their concerns for additional consideration. Snider also noted that all emergency response elements had been met throughout the plan.

Kelsey noted that he would like to see vegetation plantings not so overgrown over the site, also take into consideration overgrown vegetation along the river; not blocking the view. Phase VI is planned to offer another addition to the site of a possible civic building or cultural center building. Kelsey suggested a building not too high in elevation with glass windows to see through, as to keep the open feel and non-obstruction of the view.

Stewart inquired if the King County Courthouse site property would be taken into consideration sooner than the proposed year of 2020, at which time the County would be making a decision as to what would happen to the courthouse.

Hopkins stated that the existing plan provides for a phasing/step program that allows the accumulation of revenues to develop the site in phases.

Paul noted that the top soil used for landscaping around the campus buildings would be taken from the existing art hill. He also noted that the top soil is of good quality and will be excellent for plantings. The Art Hill will then be rough graded and grass planted.

A scale model was not included in the budget.

The Board was asked to submit their comments and/or concerns regarding the proposed plans to Tim Cox or Chris Snider.

Hopkins views this project much like the Idylwood project – opportunity study, prioritizing the difference phases of the project.

C. Perrigo Community Park Opening Debrief and Discussion

The Perrigo Park Grand Opening Celebration and Dedication was held on Saturday, July 30th at the park. Staff reported the opening was well attended and a variety of activities were demonstrated and played.

Kelsey asked staff to make an effort to schedule future events, such as these, to accommodate working schedules. Hopkins and staff so noted the request.

Snodgrass reported that the day was beautiful, the park was well maintained, and staff was available to answer any questions. A dedication plaque to the pioneering Perrigos' is prominently displayed on the restroom wall. Snodgrass thanked staff for putting together a wonderful park.

Snodgrass noted that parking has been a problem and that staff would be working on ways to alleviate the problems. Hopkins noted that steps had been initiated to address this issue, by staff event scheduling, signs and a possible overflow parking site. Snodgrass also suggested staff to let large groups know there is limited parking and encourage carpooling.

Kelsey noted that he felt land was too valuable and was not in favor of purchasing more land for parking purposes only. He suggested that during busy times, large groups should be encouraged to park at the Park & Ride and shuttle to the park.

Hopkins noted that the current situation needs to be dealt with and that remedies are being sought to alleviate the parking problem.

D. New Park Board Member – Hank Margeson

Snodgrass reported that Mr. Margeson has originally an applicant for the vacant Planning Commission vacancy and expressed an interest in serving on the Park Board. Kelsey and Snodgrass interviewed Mr. Margeson; who is a diverse interest in many recreational activities. Once Margeson is

interviewed and approved by City Council, he will then be able to become an official member of the Board. If approved, Margeson would attend his first meeting in October.

CI. New Business

A. Additional Youth Advocate

Snodgrass reported that a student from Redmond High School contacted the Parks Planning office and had expressed interest in becoming a youth advocate for the Park Board. Snodgrass had discussed this with other Board members and with Katherine Zak, the Board's current youth advocate. Board members and Zak discussed and agreed that having more than one youth advocate was a good idea, giving an interested student the opportunity to get involved and share their insight and opinions – a definite benefit to the Board and City. In the future, a tiering method was recommended – a Jr. and Sr., replacing the Jr. each year, and moving the Jr. up to the Sr. position.

Motion by Degenstein to direct staff to contact the student interested in becoming the Board's second youth advocate and advising her of the Board's approval.

Second by Stewart.

Approval: 6-0

B. Tennis Courts - Callister

Callister reported that the tennis courts at Grass Lawn had been well received by the public. Courts are utilized on a daily basis and most courts are constantly full. She also reported that the courts at Perrigo were also well utilized.

Originally, there had been some concern about the "bang wall" being too low allowing tennis balls going over the top. Hopkins reported that staff had ordered a black net to cover the top of the bang wall.

Callister also commended staff on the chosen artwork at Perrigo. She felt the artwork was the perfect choice for the park.

C. Perrigo Heights Trail – Snodgrass/Hopkins

Snodgrass noted the Board's concern regarding the slope of the development and the positioning of the trail and the houses proposed.

Boardmembers are concerned about the positioning of the sewer line on the steep slope changing the character of the area. Other pending issues of concern include loss of "hometown trails", environmental sensitivity (high density), traffic, steep slopes (geographic issues), significant trees (second growth) and surface water run off. The Park Board's interest also includes the trail connection. They asked staff to provide a site/plat map of the development.

Hopkins reported that it is his understanding the plat will provide a trail connection to the existing trail system located in that area. On September 21st the plat will be going before Council for approval, as well as the sewer line installation. Hopkins noted that the proposed trail is acceptable as required for trail connection. Staff will provide information and site plan. Hopkins encouraged Board members to collectively put their comments together to submit to Council.

VII. Reports

A. Sunset Garden Park

Ribbon cutting ceremony scheduled for October.

B. Hartman Park

Looking at RBA baseball field base cutouts – first, second and third. Washington State University converted their cutouts with artificial turf, for better play, higher durability, less maintenance. Redmond Parks is considering this due to considerable rain damage due to sand tracking. Leaving home plate still natural. Several universities have done this.

Parking Problem - Signage has been replaced and new ones put up. Leagues have been notified.

C. Idylwood Beach Park

Consultant will bring ideas for playground equipment and location will be discussed at the Board's next meeting. Staff from all divisions of parks have been meeting to discuss the aspects of safety, good

accessibility in reference to water/land, ADA accessibility, features, etc.

- C. Various
Park Board members are asked to bring their calendars to the October meeting to schedule the Board's annual retreat date and park tour.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Kelsey
Second by: Ladd
Approved: 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

By: _____
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

Date

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting
September 2, 2004
7:00 p.m.
Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center